DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 785 RC 011 969

AUTHOR Jacobsmeyer, Donald J.
TITLE Rural Education Initiative. A Report on the Regional Rural Roundtables.
INSTITUTION Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 74p.; For related document, see RC 011 968.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; Demography; Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Federal Programs; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Needs Assessment; *Rural Development; *Rural Education; *Rural Population; *School District Autonomy

ABSTRACT

To provide grassroots judgment on the validity of the 28 recommendations stemming from the May 1979 National Seminar on Rural Education and to determine how specific federal programs impact rural education, 179 invited non-federal representatives from rural organizations, rural educational systems, state departments of education, and the general rural population attended 1 of 11 regional roundtables conducted in September 1979. An additional 229 voiced their opinions by mail. In varying levels of agreement (from 94.9% to 60.1%) participants validated all 28 recommendations as feasible activities for a Federal Rural Education Initiative. Although agreement was fairly consistent geographically and across rural populations, a minority of the rural constituents consistently questioned the role of the federal government in rural education. Judging from response to the recommendations, priorities of the constituency regarding rural education appeared to be centered in the areas of funding, research, delivery systems, information dissemination, and vocational training. With regard to federal programs in general, respondents repeatedly stressed their desire for state and local control of decisions affecting their rural schools, and noted that existing federal programs placed greater administrative burdens on and are less flexible in small rural schools than large urban schools. (Author/SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184785

RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

A REPORT ON THE REGIONAL RURAL ROUNDTABLES

Submitted to:

Thomas K. Minter, Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Elementary & Secondary Education
Washington, D. C.

RC01 1969

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FEBRUARY 1980

2

PREPARED BY:

Donald J. Jacobsmeyer, Education Program Specialist
DHEW/Office of Educational Programs, Region VII
324 East 11th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

The Regional Rural Roundtables were held during September 1979. They were sponsored by the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education of the U. S. Office of Education and coordinated through the ten regional offices of the U. S. Office of Education. However, the opinions expressed in this summary report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	p. i
ABSTRACT	p. iii
RURAL ROUNDTABLE PROCEDURES	p. 1
Identification and Selection of Rural Populations	p. 1
Data Collection Instruments	p. 2
Site Selection	p. 2
Roundtable Participation and Format	p. 3
FINDINGS	p. 5
Responses to Specific Recommendations	p. 6
Differences Between Population Groups	p. 7
Differences Between Regions	p. 8
Participants' Comments to Recommendations	p. 9
RURAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN RURAL AREAS	p. 20
Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	p. 20
Title IV, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	p. 21
Education of the Handicapped Act, P.L. 94-142	p. 21
Vocational Education Act	p. 22
Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)	p. 22
General Comments	p. 23
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	p. 25
APPENDIX A - NATIONAL SEMINAR ON RURAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS	p. 30

APPENDIX B - RURAL ROUNDTABLES SITES AND DATES BY REGION p. 57

APPENDIX C - NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES BY RECOMMENDATION p. 58

APPENDIX D - RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS' AGREEMENT BY RECOMMENDATION AND GROUP p. 59

APPENDIX E - RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGES OF AGREED AND STRONGLY AGREED RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS, BY REGION p. 60

FOREWORD

The condition of education in rural areas is a major concern of the U.S. Office of Education and the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. Several rural educators and members of Congress have expressed a growing concern that perhaps rural youth and adults do not receive a quality education.

In response to this concern, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (specifically, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, the Office of Education's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, the National Institute of Education's Program on Educational Policy and Organization) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Science and Education Administration sponsored a Rural Education Conversations Seminar at College Park, Maryland on May 29-31, 1979. The purpose of this seminar was to develop recommendations for new guidelines and policies, or modify existing ones, for the Education Division of HEW and other interested agencies in the area of delivering educational services to rural children and adults.

In preparation for the seminar, the sponsoring agencies commissioned twenty-nine practitioners and experts in rural education and sociology to develop 21 issue papers that reviewed the literature, research, and educational methodology and made specific recommendations based upon their findings.

At the seminar, these practitioners and experts presented their findings and recommendations to approximately one hundred representatives of federal agencies, education and rural associations and private foundations. Participants were divided into small groups which discussed the issues presented and developed recommendations for federal education policy in six major categories:

1. Equity and quality for rural education.
2. Linking rural development and rural education.
3. Delivery of services to rural education.
4. Data collection and research.
5. Vocational and career training in rural areas.
6. Energy and rural education.

Each group then presented their recommendations to the entire group of conferees for consideration and closure. After considerable debate and discussion the conferees ultimately agreed upon a total of twenty-eight recommendations. These recommendations ranged in scope from changing administrative policy to initiating new legislation. A complete text of the recommendations with accompanying rationale and examples can be found in Appendix A of this report.

Shortly after the National Rural Education Seminar concluded, Thomas Minter, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, suggested to Norman E. Hearn, Special Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, and others, that the 28 recommendations developed at the seminar be validated by the rural constituency. William E. McLaughlin, Assistant Commissioner of the Regional Liaison Unit, offered the services of the ten regional offices to conduct such a validation effort and selected Harold L. Blackburn, Regional Commissioner for Educational Programs, Region VII, and Donald Jacobsmeyer, Education Program Specialist in rural education, Region VII, to develop an implementation plan and to serve as the lead region in the effort. This group collectively planned the strategies for conducting the series of regional meetings in which the rural constituency would provide grass root judgments on the validity of the recommendations as well as offer testimonies on how federal programs impact upon education in rural schools. The group selected the title "Rural Roundtables" to describe these regional meetings. This report describes the procedures, findings, and implications of the regional Rural Roundtables held during September 1979.

ABSTRACT

During September 1979, the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education sponsored eleven regional Rural Roundtable Discussion Groups. The purposes of the Rural Roundtable Discussion Groups were to have the rural constituency validate 28 rural education recommendations which were developed in May 1979 at the National Rural Education Seminar and to provide testimonies on how specific federal programs impact upon the condition of education in rural schools.

A total of 508 members of the rural constituency participated in this validation effort. Two hundred seventy-nine (279) rural participants attended one of the eleven roundtable discussion groups. In addition, 229 rural participants submitted their comments and suggestions to the proposed recommendations by mail.

In effect, the rural participants validated the 28 rural education recommendations as feasible activities for a Federal Rural Education Initiative. The majority of the rural participants agreed with each of the 28 recommendations, though the range of agreement was from 94.9% approval for the recommendation to examine existing federal financing formulas to 60.1% approval for the recommendation to establish a separate Office for Rural Education. All segments of the rural population from all sections of the country were fairly consistent in their degree of agreement to specific recommendations. However, a very determined segment of the rural constituency consistently questioned the federal government's role in rural education.

If the degree of agreement by the rural constituency to specific recommendations indicates their priorities in a Federal Rural Education Initiative, these priorities call for the federal government to:

1. examine federal financing formulas and other funding mechanisms to ensure local flexibility is provided (94.9% agreement);

2. establish the federal government's rural research agenda in conjunction with the rural constituency (90.5% agreement);

3. provide additional support for transportation, facilities, and delivery systems in rural school districts (89.1% agreement);

4. enable and encourage rural school districts to combine funding from various programs (86.3% agreement);

5. support communication networks to share information among rural educators (85.6% agreement); and,

6. support broad-based vocational education programs in rural areas (85.2% agreement).

Regarding federal programs in general, the rural constituency repeatly stated they desired to maintain local and state control over decisions affecting their rural schools. They also stated that existing federal education programs place a disproportionately greater administrative burden upon and are operationally less flexible in small rural schools than in large urban schools due to the diseconomies of scale. To offset the effects of the diseconomies of scale in small rural school districts, the rural constituency suggested replacing the categorical nature of federal funding with a general revenue sharing type of assistance, instituting a sparsity factor into entitlement formulas to account for the diseconomics of scale, and establishing a rural set-aside in both entitlement and discretionary grant programs to ensure rural schools receive an equitable share of federal resources.

RURAL ROUNDTABLE PROCEDURES

The Rural Roundtables attempted to inform and involve the grass roots rural constituency in the examination of rural education issues prior to any development of federal policy. In this regard, the Roundtables produced several notable results including:

- THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE NATIONAL RURAL EDUCATION SEMINAR HELD MAY 29-31, 1979 AT COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND TO 2,442 KEY MEMBERS OF THE RURAL CONSTITUENCY NATIONWIDE.

- THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL SEGMENTS OF THE RURAL CONSTITUENCY TO PRESENT THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF 28 RURAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS AT ELEVEN OPEN FORUMS (REGIONAL RURAL ROUNDTABLES) OR BY WRITTEN RESPONSES.

- THE COMPILATION OF 508 RURAL CONSTITUENTS' GRASS ROOTS JUDGEMENTS ON THE VALIDITY OF THE 28 RURAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS DEVELOPED AT THE NATIONAL SEMINAR.

IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF RURAL POPULATIONS

Four rural population groups were identified as being representatives of the rural population. A description of each identified population group follows.

Group 1 - Rural Organizations

This group contained individuals from recognized organizations which represented the general, cultural, social, and economic interests of rural communities. This group did not include any organizations representing the formal educational establishment.

Group 2 - Rural Educational Organizations and Rural Educators

This group included representatives of recognized educational associations, organizations, teachers, administrators, and school board members in rural schools and school districts.

Group 3 - State Departments of Education

This group included Chief State School Officers, or their designees, and State Department of Education staff members familiar with the issues concerning rural school districts within their respective states.

Group 4 - General Rural Populations

This group included citizens, government officials, and minority group representatives who live in rural areas, but do not represent educational organizations and are not directly providing formal educational services.

The USOE Region VII office contacted numerous national organizations and asked them to identify state and regional representatives who were knowledgeable concerning the issues of rural education. The regional offices also contacted various individuals associated with rural communities in their region and asked them to nominate additional rural people to participate in the Roundtables. With respect to the selection of the invitees:

1. No effort was made to control the variables of the population groups, i.e., numbers per group, age, sex, race, etc.

2. The effort concentrated upon identifying the greatest number of invitees who were both familiar and interested in the issues of rural education for the purposes of obtaining grass root reactions and suggestive responses to the rural education recommendations developed at College Park, Maryland, and eliciting testimonials from the rural constituency on the implementation of federal programs in rural settings.

3. No inferences to the rural population universe based upon the findings of this report are applicable duc to the sampling technique.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

USOE, Region VII, designed a data collection instrument titled, "Rural Roundtable Discussion Guide," for the Roundtable participants to record their responses to the recommendations. The Federal Education Data Acquisition Council (FEDAC) reviewed and cleared this instrument prior to the data collection activities. USOE, Region VII, also designed a one page addendum to the instrument for rural educators and State Departments of Education representatives to cite how specific OE programs impact upon the condition of education in rural schools.

SITE SELECTION

Each Regional Commissioner for Educational Programs selected the site and the date for the Rural Roundtable held in his or her region. The Regional Commissioners considered geographic proximity to rural populations, accessibility by various modes of transportation, availability of lodging accommodations, as well as the accessibility of the facilities for the handicapped in their selection. Actual sites and dates of the Roundtables are listed in Appendix B.

ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPATION AND FORMAT

The Regional Offices sent invitations and accompanying materials to Roundtable participants by mid-August, 1979. The invitations encouraged invitees who were unable to attend the Roundtable to complete and return the "Rural Roundtable Discussion Guide" to their appropriate regional office. Each regional office ensured an invitation was sent to at least one member of each rural population group in each state within their region.

The number of invitations sent and the actual number of rural participants attending varied considerably among the regions. The fact that the federal government did not reimburse any of the participants' costs associated with the Roundtables affected attendance in some regions. A numeric count of the invitations sent and participation for each Roundtable is listed below.

Region	Invitations Sent	Total Participants	Non-Federal Roundtable Participants	Non-Federal Completed Guides	Roundtable Date
I	612	54	46	118	9/28/79
II	207	14	10	28	9/20/79
III	196	10	6	10	9/13/79
IV	103	33	28	40	9/18/79
V	296	13	6	44	9/11/79
VI	146	62	57	65	9/26/79
VII	347	60	51	87	9/25/79
VIII	140	21	18	25	9/24/79
IX	225	20	14	42	9/19/79
X	170	49	43	49	9/20/79 & 9/27/79
Totals	2,442	336	279	508	

It should be noted that participation at the Roundtables increased with the amount of time available between the receipt of the invitation by the participants and the date of the Roundtable. For example, Regions V and III invitees received their invitations approximately two weeks before the scheduled Roundtable and had six participants each. On the other hand, Regions VII, VI, and I invitees received their invitations approximately one month before the scheduled Roundtable and had 51, 57, and 46 participants respectively.

All Rural Roundtables had a similar format. Each Regional Commissioner chaired the Roundtable Discussion in his or her respective region. Several members of the planning team from the National Rural Conversations Seminar assisted the Regional Commissioners by serving as a resource person at selected Roundtables. These members included: Thomas K. Minter, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education; William E. McLaughlin, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Regional Liaison Unit; Norman E. Hearn, Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education; Peggy Ross, Research Analyst, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Thomas Shultz, Research Associate and Team Leader for Rural Education, National Institute of Education; Everett D. Edington, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools; Lewis Tamblyn, Executive Director, Regional/Rural Education Association; and Gail Parks, Education Director, National Rural Center. A staff member from the USOE Region VII office was also in attendance at all the Roundtables except the one in Fairbanks, Alaska.

A total of 508 rural individuals participated in the Roundtables by either attending or returning their completed discussion guides. The 279 Roundtable participants completed their "Rural Roundtable Discussion Guide" during the course of the discussions at each Roundtable. In addition, the 229 repondents who were unable to attend the Roundtables, completed their guides and returned them by mail. Three hundred thirty (330) of the 508 respondents (64.96%) were representatives of educational organizations or associations, rural teachers, administrators, or school board members.

FINDINGS

The compilation and analyses of the responses by the 508 Roundtable participants produced several notable findings. Highlights of these findings are:

- THE MAJORITY OF THE 508 RURAL ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS AGREED WITH ALL OF THE TWENTY-EIGHT RURAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS DEVELOPED AT THE NATIONAL RURAL EDUCATION SEMINAR. THE RANGE OF AGREEMENT WAS FROM 94.9% IN RECOMMENDATION 4, WHICH CALLED FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO EXAMINE FEDERAL FINANCING FORMULAS, TO 60.1% IN RECOMMENDATION 3, WHICH CALLED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE FOR RURAL EDUCATION WITHIN HEW.

- ALL SEGMENTS (RURAL ORGANIZATIONS, RURAL EDUCATORS, STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, AND THE GENERAL RURAL POPULANCE) OF THE RURAL CONSTITUENCY PARTICIPATING AT THE ROUNDTABLES RESPONDED FAIRLY CONSISTENTLY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR DEGREE OF AGREEMENT WITH EACH RECOMMENDATION. THE FEW INCONSISTENCIES AMONG GROUPS WERE CONFINED TO PARTICULAR RECOMMENDATIONS.

- PARTICIPANTS FROM ALL TEN REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY RESPONDED FAIRLY CONSISTENTLY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR DEGREE OF AGREEMENT WITH EACH RECOMMENDATION. MOST OF THE INCONSISTENCIES AMONG REGIONS WERE CONFINED TO PARTICULAR RECOMMENDATIONS.

- THE MAJORITY OF THE RURAL PARTICIPANTS CONSISTENTLY ADVOCATED THE MAINTENANCE OF LOCAL CONTROL IN THE RURAL SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

- A VERY DETERMINED MINORITY OF THE RURAL PARTICIPANTS (IN ALL SEGMENTS OR GROUPS OF THE RURAL POPULATION AND IN ALL REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY) CONSISTENTLY STATED THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT HAVE A ROLE IN RURAL EDUCATION.

- REPRESENTATIVES OF INDIVIDUAL STATES, ASSOCIATIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS CITED THE EFFORTS THEY HAVE MADE TO IMPROVE RURAL EDUCATION IN THEIR SPHERES OF INFLUENCE.

- THE MAJORITY OF THE PARTICIPANTS DID NOT IDENTIFY THE SPECIFIC FEDERAL LAWS, REGULATIONS, OR POLICIES WHICH THEY FELT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST RURAL SCHOOLS. RATHER THEY STATED THAT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, IN GENERAL, PLACE A DISPROPORTIONATELY GREATER ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN UPON AND ARE OPERATIONALLY LESS FLEXIBLE IN SMALL RURAL SCHOOLS THAN IN LARGE URBAN SCHOOLS DUE TO THE DISECONOMIES OF SCALE.

- THE RURAL EDUCATORS OFFERED SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON WAYS IN WHICH THE CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL SCHOOLS COULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ITS DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL FUNDS. THE MOST FREQUENTLY CITED SUGGESTIONS WERE:

    1. ELIMINATE THE CATEGORICAL NATURE OF FEDERAL PROGRAM FUNDING AND REPLACE IT WITH A GENERAL REVENUE SHARING TYPE OF ASSISTANCE.

    2. INSTITUTE A SPARSITY FACTOR IN ENTITLEMENT FORMULAS.

    3. ESTABLISH A RURAL SET-ASIDE IN ENTITLEMENT AND DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS.

RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Each Rural Roundtable participant received a "Rural Roundtable Discussion Guide" instrument. On this instrument, the participants indicated on a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree their feelings to each recommendation. The actual numbers and percentages of participants' responses by category and recommendation is located in Appendix C of this report.

The majority of the 508 participants indicated they either strongly agreed or agreed with each of the 28 recommendations. The range of agreement to specific recommendations was from 94.9 agreement (66.6% strongly agree and 28.3% agree) to recommendation 4, which called for the federal government to examine federal financing formulas to ensure maximum local flexibility, to 60.1% agreement (25.4% strongly agree and 34.7 agree) to recommendation 3, which called for the establishment of an Office for Rural Education within HEW or the Department of Education.

At least four out of five of the participants either strongly agreed or agreed with eight of the recommendations. These eight recommendations in agreement order are:

Recommendation 4 (Flexible Funding Mechanism) - 94.9% agreement

Recommendation 21 (Collaborative Research Agenda) - 90.5% agreement

Recommendation 5 (Additional Financial Support) - 89.1% agreement

Recommendation 13 (Combine Funding) - 86.3% agreement

Recommendation 9 (Communication Network) - 85.6% agreement

Recommendation 25 (Broad-Based Vocational Education) - 85.2% agreement

Recommendation 24 (Vocational Service Delivery Systems) - 81.8% agreement

Recommendation 18 (Education Service Agencies) - 80.1% agreement

Only to four recommendations did more than 20% of the participants indicate they either disagreed or strongly disagreed and no more than 27.3% of the participants indicated such disagreement to any particular recommendation.

More participants indicated they were "undecided" with the following recommendations:

Recommendation 12 (Broader Involvement) - 19% undecided

Recommendation 10 (Rural Education Act) - 17% undecided

Recommendation 14 (International Experiments) - 15% undecided

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POPULATION GROUPS

For the purposes of the Rural Roundtables, four separate groups or populations constitute the rural population. These groups were:

Group 1 - Representatives of rural organizations

Group 2 - Rural educators, administrators, school board members, and representatives of rural educational organizations and associations

Group 3 - Representatives of State Departments of Education

Group 4 - Rural individuals not associated with the other groups

The majority of the participants from each rural population group indicated they either strongly agreed or agreed with each of the 28 recommendations. The range of agreement was from 96.5% by rural educators to Recommendation 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas) to 55.7% by State Departments of Education to Recommendation 10 (Rural Education Act). Appendix D of this report lists the rank order and percentage of agreement to each recommendation by each of the rural population groups.

More representatives of rural organizations agreed with more of the 28 recommendations than the other three groups. Eighty-two percent (82%) of the representatives of the rural organizations responded with either an agree or strongly agree response to all 28 recommendations. This group was followed by rural educators and representatives of educational organizations (76.3%), State Departments of Education representatives (74.8%), and the general rural population (72.9%) in the degree of agreement with the 28 recommendations.

All four groups of the rural population generally agreed to the same extent with each of the recommendations. The groups varied less than 15% from the highest to the lowest group in twenty of the 28 recommendations. Only to Recommendation 8 (Technical Assistance, 22.5% variance) and Recommendation 11 (Local Capacity Building, 22.8% variance) did the groups vary more than 20%. There was also little variance and great consistency in the rank-ordering of the recommendations by the groups. For the rank order and percentage of participants' agreement by recommendation and group see the table in Appendix D.

The consistency in agreement among the four rural groups to specific recommendations is illustrated in the two recommendations with the greatest variance. The rural groups, of course, responded much more consistently to the other recommendations.

To Recommendation 8 (Technical Assistance), 90.2% of the rural organization representatives indicated they either strongly agreed or agreed, while 81.4% of the rural educators, 70.6% of the general rural populance, and 67.7% of State Departments of Education representatives indicated such agreement.

To Recommendation 11 (Local Capacity Building), 86.1% of the rural organization representatives, 83.4% of State Departments of Education representatives, 81.5% of the rural educators, and 63.3% of the general rural populance indicated they either agreed or strongly agreed.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REGIONS

Participation in the Roundtables varied considerably among the ten USOE regions of the country. The range of participation was from 118 rural individuals in Region I (New England States) to ten in Region III (Mid-Atlantic States). For this reason, specific comparisons between regions is difficult. However, certain generalized findings are possible.

Participants from all ten regions of the country generally agreed with the 28 recommendations, although the range of agreement to specific recommendations by particular regions was from 100% to 44%. All participants (100%) from two of the regions agreed to several of the recommendations. In Region III (Mid-Atlantic States), 100% of the particpants agreed with Recommendations 21 (Collaborative Research Agenda) and 22 (Coordination of Vocational Programs). In Region VIII (Western Mountain and Plains States), 100% of the participants agreed with Recommendations 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas), 21 (Collaborative Research Agenda, 18 (Technology), and 20 (Rural Research). This is contrasted with only 44% of the participants from Region VIII agreeing with Recommendation 16 (Rural Teacher Incentives).

Region VIII participants tended to agree with more recommendations than the other nine regions. Of the total responses to all twenty-eight recommendations, 82.6% of the participants from Region VIII responded with either agree or strongly agree response. This is contrasted with Region IX, where 72.2% of the participants responded with an agree or strongly agree response to the total twenty-eight recommendations. Participants from the other USOE regions responded to all 28 recommendations by degree of agreement accordingly: Region II - 81.9%, Region IV - 81.3%, Region III - 77.1%, Region X - 77.0%, Region I - 76.4%, Region VI - 74.7% Region VII - 73.3%, and Region V - 72.3%.

Participants from the ten regions of the country also responded fairly consistently in their degree of agreement to specific recommendations, although not to the degree that the four rural groups did. A rank ordering of the specific recommendations by degree of agreement by the participants from each region is found in Appendix E of this report.

PARTICIPANTS' COMMENTS TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of the participants expressed comments to the various recommendations which provide an insight into their rationale for their responses. A summary of their comments to each recommendation follows.

Recommendation 1 (Executive Order) (74.8% Agreement)

The majority (74.8%) of the participants who agreed with this recommendation which called for the President to issue an Executive Order either indicated such an action was urgently needed to raise the nation's level of consciousness to the needs of rural education or stated simply that such an Executive Order would only have the possibility of producing benefits for rural education. These two feelings are illustrated by two participants' comments:

> "This (executive order) is an absolute must."
>
> "Not a long range solution and no assurance of any major changes at all, but it (executive order) could be instituted quickly and possibly help us."

More representatives of rural organizations (80.5%) agreed with this recommendation than the other three groups; rural educators (76.4%), State Department of Education (82.0%), and general rural populance, (66.6%).

Recommendation 2 (Interagency Coordinating Body) (60.4% Agreement)

While a majority of the respondents (60.4%) agreed with this recommendation, which called for the federal government to establish a federal interagency coordinating body, many expressed a concern that this coordinating body might simply become a "paper mill" and be ineffective if it was not responsive to local needs. Almost all of the respondents agreeing with this recommendation expressed a concern similar to, "We don't need another level of bureaucracy, but we need the resources."

On the other hand, many respondents who disagreed with the recommendation overwhelmingly stated they did not wish to add to or enlarge the federal government's education division. Repeatedly, they stated, "Too many groups now!", "I don't want another agency to deal with.", and "This would create another layer of bureaucracy."

Recommendation 3 (Office of Rural Education) (60.1% Agreement)

The participants reacted to the creation of an Office of Rural Education much in the same manner as they did to the estalishment of an interagency coordinating body (Recommendation 2). While the majority (60.1%) favored the recommendation, many expressed a concern with increasing the number of federal employees and regulatory authority as evidenced by statements such as, "I don't like to see additions to government employees, but if this is the only way (to draw attention to rural needs) then it will have to be." and "Only if it (Office of Rural Education) is for advocacy and not regulation."

As with Recommendation 2, the participants who disagreed with this recommendation felt a separate Office of Rural Education would add another administrative layer to the federal government. This view can be summarized by one participant who stated, "We have enough 'red tape' to deal with at the present time without adding to the burden."

Recommendation 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas) (94.9% Agreement)

The participants rated this recommendation, calling for the federal government to examine financing formulas to ensure maximum local flexibility, the highest. Of the 498 participants who responded to this recommendation, 332 (66.6%) indicated they strongly agree and 141 (28.3%) indicated they agree. All groups and all regions were very consistent in their degree of agreement with this recommendation.

While agreeing very strongly with this recommendation, many participants cited the need to establish a sparsity factor in existing formulas to compensate for the diseconomies of scale in providing services to "special" rural populations. Other participants frequently cited the pressing need for local flexibility in administering federal programs, again due to the diseconomies of scale. The participants expressed these two views by stating:

> "We must provide the same services to students without regard to size of special populations."
>
> "Sparsity factor definitely needs to be included in all financing formulas to offset diseconomies of scale. Specific rural set asides need to be initiated."
>
> "Local flexibility is the key!"
>
> "Existing federal formulas and regulations governing funding to rural states and local school districts prevent, or even preclude, local initiative in seeking such support and, moreover, tend to negate local interest in seeking or utilizing Federal funds."
>
> "Amen! Federal funding is geared to numbers and density; also to urban needs. Guidelines and criteria need revision."

The few negative responses and comments to Recommendation 4 questioned the Constitutionality of federal aid to education, such as, "Federal money should not be spent on education!", and "Leave education to the States."

Recommendation 5 (Additional Financial Support) (89.1% Agreement)

As with Recommendation 4, the great majority (89.1%) of the participants also supported this recommendation which called for providing additional support for the areas of transportation, facilities, and delivery systems in rural school districts. Many participants cited the need for additional funds in these areas, but again they stated that they didn't want to lose local control. One participant summed up this view by stating:

"Federal support toward each of the above areas is lacking expecially in the areas of transportation and energy-related issues. Although additional support is necessary, Federal policies and regulations must be responsive to 'local control and use' of such funds."

Recommendation 6 (Rural Curriculum) (77.2% Agreement)

Over three out of four participants (77.2%) agreed with this recommendation, which called for the federal government to encourage, but not direct, the development of relevant curricula for rural schools. Many of these participants stated that much of the curriculum currently in rural schools either has an urban bias or is outmoded. Many participants also stated that curricula could be best developed at the state or local level while expressing a strong concern against the federal government actually developing curricula.

Many of the participants who disagreed with this recommendation also expressed the concern that curriculum decisions were state and local decisions, but suggested that if the federal government encouraged (supported curriculum development it would ultimately become involved in the decision-making process.

Recommendation 7 (Encourage Community-Based Organizations) (77.8% Agreement)

While the majority (77.8%) of the participants agreed with this recommendation which called for the federal government to encourage and support community-based educational organizations, their comments were divided between two points of view. One view was that community-based educational organizations are an untapped resource for rural schools in many areas. The other view was that community-based educational organizations would be competing with school districts for already limited funds. The representative of rural organization favored this recommendation (87% agreement) more than the other three groups.

Recommendation 8 (Technical Assistance) (78.2% Agreement)

Almost four out of five (78.2%) of the participants agreed with this recommendation which called for the federal government to provide technical assistance to rural schools in order for them to compete with urban schools for competitive funds. Many of the participants who agreed with this recommendation stated that, "Rural administrators rarely have the time or staff to compete for federal funds."

Participants who disagreed with the recommendation did so with the idea that states should be providing the necessary technical assistance, not the federal government. Fewer State Departments of Education representatives (67.7%) agreed or strongly agreed with this recommendation than the other three groups.

Recommendation 9 (Communication Network) (85.6% Agreement)

The participants rated this recommendation, calling for the federal government to support communication networks for rural schools, very highly. Many of the participants who agreed cited the sharing of information among rural districts as a pressing need. This need is illustrated by one participant who stated, "Currently there is no way of sharing data in these disparate areas."

The participants expressed basically two different suggestions on the establishment of a rural communication network. One suggestion was to incorporate it into existing networks such as the National Diffusion Network (NDN). The other suggestion was to establish an entirely separate network for rural schools.

Recommendation 10 (Rural Education Act) (63.9% Agreement)

The participants reacted to this recommendation, which called for enacting a Rural Education Act along two extremes. The majority (63.9%) of the participants agreeing with the recommendation felt it was necessary to provide rural equity. This view was best expressed by one participant who stated, "It (rural equity) is the only way it's going to happen." However, several commenters also expressed concern that the legislation not create an additional administrative burden upon local school districts and erode local control in decision-making.

The view of the participants who disagreed with the recommendation can best be illustrated by one commenter who stated, "Congress has no business in education."

A sizeable number (17.4%) of the participants stated that they were undecided over this recommendation. This group of participants expressed confusion as to how a Rural Education Act would ultimately impact upon a local school district.

Recommendation 11 (Local Capacity Building) (79.9% Agreement)

While the majority (79.9%) of the participants agreed with this recommendation, which called for the federal government to provide funds for assessing rural needs, many stated that local control must be maintained with few or no strings attached.

Participants disagreeing with this recommendation either felt that rural districts already knew what their needs were or that states and local school districts should assess their own needs without federal involvement.

Recommendation 12 (Broader Involvement) (68.1% Agreement)

One comment, "Small fragmented programs are of little value to the students involved." summed up the feelings of the majority (68.1%) of the participants who agreed with this recommendation. However, many of these participants again expressed concern that local control be maintained

in implementing this recommendation, which called for the supporting of community-based organizations, committees, and institutions in an effort to meet local needs.

Participants disagreeing with the recommendation generally felt that better use of the time and funds needed to accomplish the recommendation should be put into providing needed and direct services to students. Almost one out of five participants (19.0%) indicated they were undecided with this recommendation, primarily due to their uncertainty of how it would actually be implemented.

Recommendation 13 (Combined Funding) (86.3% Agreement)

The majority (86.3%) of the participants agreed with this recommendation, which called for encouraging rural communities and organizations to combine funding from various agencies to improve services to students. Many of the participants cited the disadvantages rural schools have with existing categorical funded programs and suggested replacing categorical programs with general assistance similar to revenue sharing.

However, one participant presented the case for categorical funding by stating "Mechanisms are in place for similar interagency agreements at the local level. In some cases, however, it may be desirable for funds to be categorically allocated for issue protection."

Recommendation 14 (International Experiments) (65.0% Agreement)

The majority (65.0%) of the participants agreed with this recommendation, which advocated the federal government gathering and disseminating successful rural education experiments in other countries, though not to the extent as most of the other recommendations. The participants' responses and comments ranged from both ends of the spectrum and all points in-between. Two comments illustrate these extremes. One participant, who strongly agreed, stated, "The U.S. could learn much from such efforts as the Australian Country Education Project and the United Kingdom's study on Sparsely Populated Areas." Another participant, who strongly disagreed, stated, "Seldom do programs in other countries relate to America's needs." A sizeable number (15.1%) of the participants stated that they were undecided with this recommendation.

Recommendation 15 (Teacher Training) (71.2% Agreement)

Almost three out of four participants (71.2%) agreed with this recommendation, which called for the federal government to provide resources for establishing specialized rural preservice and inservice training programs.

Many participants who expressed agreement cited the need for teacher recruitment and retention in rural schools, particularly in the more isolated rural districts. One participant expressed this need by stating, "We pay (teachers) $2,000 above the state average, but we don't have a supply of extra people wanting to teach in our system because of the rural area." However, most participants stated that their rural teachers were paid considerably less than urban areas.

More representatives of rural organizations (83.3%) agreed with this recommendation than rural educators (72.7%), State Departments of Education (63.4%), and the rural populance (66.6%). The most common objections to this recommendation were that teacher training should be a state or local function and that the proposed program would create another categorical program with subsequent applications and reporting forms.

Recommendation 16 (Rural Teacher Incentives) (68.0% Agreement)

The majority of the participants who agreed with this recommendation (68.0%) indicated that something is needed to attract teachers into the rural areas. This view was expressed by one participant who stated, "Nothing like this currently exists and is definitely needed. Salary differences for new and experienced teachers and administrators in rural versus urban schools are discriminatory in states where school funding is tied to enrollments."

Fewer representatives of State Departments of Education (60.6%) agreed with this recommendation than representatives of rural organizations (79.9%), rural educators (69.9%), and the rural populance (63.3%). Also, more participants (82.0%) from Region IV agreed with this recommendation than other regions. In fact, less than half of the participants from Region III (40.7%) and Region VII (44.0%) agreed with this recommendation.

Many of the participants disagreeing with this recommendation stated that while such a program may attract teachers to rural areas, they probably wouldn't stay there longer than they would be required to do so. One of these participants, a teacher, stated, "The incentive would help me pay for my house, but rural schools do not need personnel who are interested only in the incentive. This would only compound the problems."

Recommendation 17 (Technology) (77.7%)

Participants from all rural groups and regions responded very similarly to this recommendation. They generally stated that technology could solve many of the inherent problems associated with isolated rural areas. Several participants cited examples such as the Appalachian Regional Satellite Project, which could serve as models.

The participants who disagreed with the recommendation questioned the costs associated with such technology and the inflexibility of rural school districts' budgets to continue programs after federal assistance ceases.

Recommendation 18 (Education Service Agencies) (80.1% Agreement)

While four out of five of the total participants (80.1%) agreed with this recommendation, ninety percent (90.0%) of the representatives of rural organizations agreed. Many participants from the group suggested the Agricultural Extension Service Model as an effective delivery system for rural areas.

The few participants (9.2%) who disagreed with this recommendation generally stated that Education Service Agencies tend to restrict local control by mandating certain types of programs and services not necessarily needed while at the same time further restricting local budgetary control.

Recommendation 19 (Rural Data) (71.8% Agreement)

While the four rural groups responded very similarly to this recommendation (less than 10% difference between the highest and lowest group), participants from the various regions differed greatly from a range of 100% agreement in Region VIII to 59.5% agreement in Region IX.

Participants agreeing with the recommendation generally stated a deficiency exists in collecting data on small rural districts. One participant expressed this view by stating, "In 1976-77, there were 15,891 school districts of which 41% were smaller rural districts operating with fewer than 1,000 students, 27% were operating with fewer than 600 students and 11.5% were operating with fewer than 300 students. Each of these school district size categories are faced with their own unique problems. Comparative data needs to be compiled and broken down in greater detail rather than lumping all districts with fewer than 2,500 students into one category. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) doesn't even collect data on districts enrolling fewer than 300 students, yet there are 1,247 districts operating K-12 schools with fewer than 300 students."

Participants disagreeing with the recommendation generally stated that such a compilation of data would probably necessitate rural administrator completing more forms and reports.

Recommendation 20 (Rural Research) (78.7% Agreement)

The majority of the participants agreeing with this recommendation (78.7%) generally stated that more research is needed in rural schools, but added that rural schools must make the decisions whether to implement or not implement programs. In other words, local control must be preserved.

The participants who disagreed generally stated that research begets more research and not necessarily better services. One participant summed up this view by stating, "Research in this area is for researchers, not to improve education. Why not talk to the people educating the children?"

Recommendation 21 (Collaborative Research Agenda) (90.5% Agreement)

Only to Recommendation 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas) did more participants agree or strongly agree with a particular recommendation. Over ninety percent (90.5%) agreed with a collaborative research agenda. All groups and regions of the country equally supported this recommendation. The overwhelming majority of the participants stated a sense of disbelief that the research agenda would be established without involvement of the rural constituency. Several participants expressed this view by stating "(There) should be no questions about this one.", and "Obviously, and school boards also."

One participant, while chastizing previous federal policy in this area, pinpointed a dilemma in accomplishing this recommendation.

"Both Federal policy and practices that lead to the establishment of a 'research agenda' have failed to include, in appropriate proportions, representatives from the rural community. This dilemma has been enhanced, at least in part, by rural educators' lack of awareness about the 'process' of setting such an agenda."

Recommendation 22 (Coordination of Vocational Programs) (77.1% Agreement)

Participants from all population groups responded very consistently in agreeing to this recommendation. The difference from the highest and lowest rural group was only 4.1%. However, the range of agreement in the regions was from 100% by Region III participants to 67.4% by Region VII.

Participants (77.1%) agreeing with the recommendation, which called for the federal government to provide formal coordination of federal vocational and other training programs, stated that they did so for a number of reasons. Generally, these participants cited the need for accessible vocational programs in rural areas and that hopefully, such coordination at the federal level would provide for a more comprehensive approach to vocational training programs in rural areas. These participants also stated that they did not wish to see additional coordinating bodies established. Rather, they stated existing personnel, preferably at the state level, could accomplish such coordination.

Participants who disagreed with the recommendation generally stated that any formal coordination would inherently create additional paperwork.

Recommendation 23 (Guidance and Counseling) (73.2% Agreement)

The majority of the participants (73.2%) supporting this recommendation continually stated that rural schools are lacking in guidance and counseling programs and materials. One rural educator stated, "Too many of our students today are being counseled out of their local communities because of urban oriented vocational materials and ill-prepared rural counselors who are not equipped to work with school and community development projects that would place emphasis on teaching student skills for creating their own opportunities in our

small communities." Several participants suggested using existing programs such as Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary Act and the National Diffusion Network (NDN) to develop and disseminate rural guidance and counseling programs.

The participants who disagreed generally stated that such a program would be ineffective due to the fact that rural populations are too diversified from community to community. The view was expressed by two participants. One stated, "The needs of rural learners are unique in each area of the United States. In no way should the federal government be involved in this kind of service." The other one stated, "I doubt that rural and urban kids are that different in psychological development and needs, nor can a set of materials be developed to meet the various rural populations."

Recommendation 24 (Vocational Service Delivery Systems) (81.8% Agreement)

Over four out of five participants (81.8%) expressed agreement with this recommendation which called for the federal government to support research program development and evaluation of career/vocational services to rural clientele. There was little difference in the degree of agreement by the various rural populations and regions of the country.

One rural educator perhaps concerned that such support could be fragmented without proper directions stated, "(I agree) if offered as an integral component of a comprehensive delivery system. There is the threat here of piecemeal development."

While another rural educator stated, "(The) federal role in research is never disputed.", although several of his colleagues disagreed and stated, "The Feds should stay out. This is a state and local function."

Recommendation 25 (Broad Based Vocational Education) (85.2% Agreement)

While the majority of the participants (85.2%) expressed agreement with the general intent of this recommendation, which called for the federal government to support broad-based vocational education programs, they differed on the rationale for so doing. One viewpoint was that vocational education should serve as a catalyst to stimulate economic development in rural areas. The other viewpoint was that rural vocational education should provide the wide range of training to enable rural youngsters who chose to leave the rural community to be able to compete in the urbanized areas.

One rural educator stated that the current vocational education program generally prohibits broad-based vocational training in many rural areas due to the mandatory requirement to provide training for only the occupations which are projected to have opportunities in their community or area.

Recommendation 26 (Rural Women) (67.6% Agreement)

Even though two out of three participants (67.6%) agreed with this recommendation, many stated that other minorities, such as migrant workers and Native Americans, are also in need and should likewise be included.

The suggestion most often recommended by the participants was providing day care services for women entering or re-entering the work force. Many of these participants also stated that strict requirements of day-care facilities have forced many day-care facilities to shut down in rural areas.

Many of the participants who disagreed with the recommendation cited a concern over establishing another "categorical" program which would require additional paperwork.

Recommendation 27 (School Consolidation Policies) (63.5% Agreement)

Even though over three out of five participants (63.5%) favored this recommendation, which called for the federal government to assess the wisdom of school consolidation policies, it was rated one of the lowest of the 28 recommendations. In fact, more participants (70) strongly disagreed with this recommendation than any other.

Many of the participants who agreed with the recommendation expressed caution that the federal government's role should only be to provide support for research or studies pertaining to school consolidation and never become involved in the actual decisions as to whether a rural school district should or should not be consolidated.

The participants who disagreed generally stated that the federal government should not be involved in anything pertaining to school consolidation.

Recommendation 28 (Energy) (79.0% Agreement)

The majority (79.0%) of the participants supported this recommendation, which called for the federal government to develop a program of energy conservation measures. Little difference existed between the various rural groups in their degree of agreement. However, there were slight differences between participants from the various regions of the country. The participants from the Northeast sections of the country (Region I-86.0%; Region II-85.7%; and Region III-88.8%) expressed more agreement than the participants from the South and Southwest sections of the country (Region IV-76.9% and Region VI-66.6%).

Many participants who agreed with the recommendation offered suggestions on how such an energy program might operate. For example, one participant stated,

"(The energy program) should be in two steps:

1. Energy assessments, such as the NSD/NEIG project, on the use of thermographic analysis of heat loss and resulting recommendations for alternative solutions, and

2. Fiscal support for retrofitting/reconstruction efforts by local school districts. The establishment of Federal minimal guidelines have not been very effective since, once again, Federal perceptions, policies, and mandates do not typically consider state and local input and governance of the solution process."

The participants who disagreed with the recommendation generally stated that they felt this was presently being implemented by the Department of Energy and consequently not needed.

RURAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN RURAL AREAS

In addition to obtaining grass root judgements on the validity of the 28 recommendations, a major objective of the Roundtables was to solicit information from rural educators on how current Federal educational programs impact upon the condition of education in rural schools. In other words, rural educators were asked to identify specific perceived deficiencies in existing Federal education programs and to suggest ways in which these deficiencies could be corrected. This section attempts to summarize their comments and suggestions by program.

TITLE I, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA)

Recent amendments to Title I requires each local school receiving assistance to have a Parent Advisory Council in addition to a district-wide council. Although several rural educators cited this as a problem, one educator summed up the effects of this requirement in small schools.

> "The specific regulatory requirement in question is Section 125 of Public Law 95-561. This section specifies new procedures concerning the formation of school area parent councils in addition to a district-wide parent council. Provisions of this section when implemented result in the formation of an excessive number of school advisory councils in a rural state where small schools are numerous, parents few, and funds limited. In addition, this law places an undue burden upon project directors to implement its requirements limiting their effectiveness in other areas.
>
> The law requires that a district advisory council and three school advisory councils be formed in our district. These four councils are expected to be active for only sixty-five participants in all three elementaries. The superintendent/ project director would be responsible for coordinating their formation and continuing activity. This places an undue amount of extra administrative requirements for $23,000. Our state has numerous examples of this type.
>
> A change is recommended to the rules and regulations previously in effect. Section 116a. 23(f) does not require local educational agencies to have school advisory councils if it has 1,000 or fewer students or has only one attendance center. This regulation excluded small schools with a number of school attendance areas but did include urban areas where additional parent involvement is necessary."

Several rural educators cited the recently enacted Title I Concentration Grants as being intended primarily for urban school districts, but did not state specifics.

One rural educator requested additional flexibility in use of Title I material for rural schools.

> "There is also some concern that materials purchased for Title I schools should not be shared in buildings that do not qualify. This is understandable to a degree, but wouldn't it be more desirable to share these available materials with other teachers when they were not in use in Title I buildings? In many rural schools, the materials and equipment resources are inferior."

TITLE IV, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA)

Many of the participants stated that Title IV of ESEA both Part B and C were workable programs in rural schools, although they had several suggestions on possible improvements. One suggestion was to build into Title IV-C a criteria which would allow for funds to be awarded on the basis of documented needs as well as costs per pupil. The commenter who offered this suggestion stated that rural schools often have a higher per pupil cost in programs and that this higher cost is not taken into account in the awarding of funds. Another suggestion was to encourage greater flexibility in Title IV-B by allowing inservice training for the teachers to become aware of exemplary instructional method in using the purchased materials and equipment.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT, P.L. 94-142

Several participants stated that transportation costs to comply with Public Law 94-142 were excessive in isolated rural areas where distances are great between facilities and students. These participants recommended providing additional funds to these districts to cover these transportation costs.

Several other participants stated that the costs of providing IEP mandated instructional and related services in rural schools are also excessive due to the small number of handicapped children in need of highly specified services. These participants also stated that often they are unable to recruit and hire specialists or to contract for the needed services in remote rural areas.

One participant described his frustration by stating that, "P.L. 94-142 should be funded at 100% of excess costs. As director of an eight school district co-op with an ADA of 4,200 students, we have insufficient funding available. After school started this year I had eight profoundly handicapped students move into seven different districts. Two of these students required a one to one ratio of teacher to student. One child had been in a psychiatric mental ward as a resident. All of my classes were in progress and my 94-142 funds designated for specific students as per my application which took four months to be approved. Money should be available in high growth rural areas for situations such as this."

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

One participant suggested that small enrollments exclude many rural schools from receiving vocational education funds for Disadvantaged and Handicapped students and Professional Development under Subpart 3 of the Vocational Education Act.

Another participant suggested that restricting vocational education programs to employment needs in the immediate area in effect limited the vocational training options of rural students. His recommendation was to eliminate this requirement and allow local districts to determine the types of training offered.

Concern was also expressed by one participant about the perceived changes occurring in vocational agriculture.

> "My own background is Agricultural Education and I have worked in this field as a high school teacher for eight years and a teacher educator for twenty-two years. As you perhaps know, this program was originally designed to be vocational which became translated into a program for high school youth and adults who were engaged in agricultural occupations. Such a role for this teacher required a strong community orientation working with people engaged in agricultural work.
>
> Much of this orientation is changing and increasingly this program is retreating to a high school classroom program. Such a change reduces teacher contact with those engaged in agricultural work (adults) which often reduces the emphasis a teacher devotes to supervised occupational experience programs for high school youth in the program. Increasingly youth programs (FFA) are becoming more school and less community oriented. Roughly, 20% of our teachers of agriculture are now employed less than twelve months. This situation is a concern to Agricultural Educators in the nation and the Southern States."

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT (ESAA)

Several rural educators cited the ESAA programs as mainly beneficial to urban areas. They stated that this was due to the evaluation criteria of applying both "quality" and "quantity" points. They stated that quantity points are given to applicants based upon the sheer numbers of minority students in the district and the numbers of students affected by a district's Desegregation Plan. On the other hand, they stated, "quality" points are given to applicants based upon the educational soundness of a district's application and instructional methodology related to its identified need. Several rural educators stated that the application of quantity points places them at a severe disadvantage in competing for ESAA funds.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Most of the rural educators stated that while the intent of federal programs was commendable, they (Federal education programs) need to be made more flexible for the small rural school districts. Rural educators continually stated that the amount of funds received often doesn't justify the administrative costs.

The overwhelming concerns expressed by rural educators to Federal education programs in general were on the excessive amount of paperwork required to receive and maintain federal funds and the excessive amount of restrictions mandated by the categorical nature of federal education programs. According to the rural educators, these two concerns affect small rural school districts to a greater extent than large urban districts due primarily to the diseconomies of scale.

They also stated that small rural schools have certain characteristics which are not considered by most federal education programs. One participant described two of these characteristics by stating, "Sparsity of population and small numbers of clients to be served are characteristics which can be generalized to most rural areas. These two characteristics create a host of problems for rural educators. The two most common are:

1. High costs for travel in terms of both time and money.

2. High costs on a per client served basis for programs and services.

Because of these two problems, rural populations are extremely disadvantaged in the availability of a broad range of educational programs. Many potential rural clients remain unserved because costs are considered excessive. If rural populations are to be adequately served, the high program costs associated with sparsity of population and the small numbers of potential clients must be addressed by funding procedures."

Several rural educators offered suggestions on ways in which the characteristics of rural schools could be taken into account by the federal government in its distribution of educational funds. The most frequently cited suggestions were:

1. Eliminate the categorical nature of federal program funding and replace it with a general revenue sharing type of aid.

2. Institute a sparsity factor in entitlement formulas.

3. Establish a rural set-aside in entitlement and discretionary grant programs.

Several rural educators also described their federal programs and the benefits they (federal programs) provided to students. One example of this type of description is from a rural superintendent

who stated, "The Title I money that we've received in the past 3 years has been increasing from about $12,000 per year until now we received $18,000 this year. This money has been used to fund our Developmental Reading Program. We feel that this program has given much needed individual attention to the reading problems of some of our youngsters.

Title IV-B money over the past years has been used to help the Area Education Agency purchase films, used to purchase a computer terminal, and used to almost complete the closed circuit TV system in the building. It has been very helpful.

Last summer, all of our elementary teachers who teach reading were able to work three days during the summer on special materials because of money from Title IV-C.

Of course, we also get help with the hot lunch program from the federal government, thus enabling us to provide a good meal at very reasonable prices.

All-in-all I believe that the federal money we receive is put to very good use. The major problem with federal funds is the many guidelines attached to it. Sometimes an administrator gets the feeling that he's not to be trusted. I realize that taxpayers are pushing for accountability, but much money is inaccessible because of the many requirements with which the school must comply. I believe this to be particularly true in small rural schools."

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

As the findings indicate, the rural participants responded favorably to all 28 recommendations and did so in a fairly consistent manner across the various rural populations and regions of the country. The implication of such consistent favorable responses is that the rural participants would support a federal rural education initiative directed towards achieving the objectives of the recommendations.

However, the rural participants' support was conditional and not carte blanche. The participants repeatedly stated under what terms and conditions they supported each of the recommendations. In general, these terms and conditions advocated such an initiative should be built upon and not diminish the strengths of rural schools in correcting the identified weaknesses.

The implication of the rural participants supporting a federal rural education initiative is put in perspective when one considers several questions and observations.

First, were the Rural Roundtable participants actually representatives of the rural constituency at the grass root level? To begin with, one would encounter the same difficulty in attempting to define "grass root level" as one would have defining the term "rural." Nevertheless, several facts need to be restated. Over 2,300 individuals were invited to the Roundtables nation-wide. The majority of these invitations were sent to rural education practitioners, i.e. rural school superintendents.

While the majority of the actual 279 participants at the Roundtables were primarily representatives of professional education organizations, colleges and universities, and State Departments of Education, the majority of the 229 responses returned by mail were from rural school administrators and teachers. With these facts in mind, the question of whether the Roundtable participants were actually representatives of the rural constituency at the grass roots level will probably be answered based upon individual interpretations and motives. Regardless of interpretation and motive, it is felt a concentrated effort was made to involve the actual rural constituency in the Roundtables. Furthermore, it is seriously questioned whether a more representative and greater sample of the rural constituency could have been assembled and involved in the validation of the 28 recommendations through any other process considering the extemely short time line for the validation process and fiscal constraints of not reimbursing participants' costs.

Second, is the rural constituency a unified group as indicated by the small variance between its different groups and regions of the country? The participants' responses were very consistent in the degree of agreement to specific recommendations between the different identified segments of the rural population and regions of the country.

It is not felt that the rural constituency is a unified group. At all roundtables, participants continually noted the great difference

among rural populations in different sections of the country. Several factors, perhaps, could account for the great similarity of agreement to the recommendations among the different groups and regions of the country.

1. Almost all recommendations referred to local determination. Therefore, each population group and region could have interpreted the recommendations as possibly solving their local needs.

2. Participants at the Roundtable discussion groups heard different positions and opinions which might have influenced their responses one way or another.

3. All recommendations were written very positively without reference to the specific impact upon persons or situations. To quote one participant, "I would like to say that I hope the needs of rural America could be defined in more specific terms. To be against any of these general terms would be like being against Chevrolet, motherhood, and baseball."

Third, why did the participants consistently favor certain recommendations over others? For example, Recommendation 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas) was the most highly supported recommendation by almost all groups and regions. Likewise, Recommendation 3 (Rural Education Office) was the least supported by almost all groups and regions.

The Rural Roundtable participants apparently favored recommendations which they perceived as producing direct and visible benefits with fewer potential liabilities more so than recommendations in which the benefits were perceived as being unclear and vague or the potential benefits could be diminshed by potential liabilities (loss of local control or increased paperwork). To illustrate this point, it is necessary to describe the most favored and least favored recommendations in light of perceived benefits and liabilities.

The four most highly rated recommendations were Recommendations 4 (Flexible Financing Formulas), 5 (Additional Financial Support), 21 (Collaborative Research Agenda), and 13 (Combine Funding).

Recommendation 4 called for the examination of federal financing formulas and other funding mechanisms to provide maximum local flexibility. If the majority of the rural population felt they presently are not receiving an equitable share of federal funds, any examining of current formulas could only produce greater funds. Key words in the recommendation were "provide maximum local flexibility" which implies local control of decisions. There is no apparent liability with this recommendation.

Likewise, Recommendation 5 called for additional support in the areas of transportation, facilities, and delivery systems to provide equitable services to special populations. Here again, the benefits would be

additional funds for several of the most expensive cost factors of rural schools--transportation, facilities, and delivery systems--expecially when related to special populations such as the handicapped. The liabilities could be additional paperwork in the form of reports and applications; but since these are major cost factors, the potential benefits apparently overshadowed the liabilities.

Both Recommendation 13, which calls for rural communities and agencies to be encouraged to combine funding from various agencies, and Recommendation 21, which calls for the rural education research agenda to be established in conjunction with the rural communities, have the potential of producing only benefits without liabilities. These two recommendations, of course, were consistently rated highly by all groups and regions.

The least favored recommendations were Recommendations 3 (Rural Education Office), 2 (Interagency Coordinating Body), 27 (School Consoldiation), and 10 (Rural Education Act).

Recommendations 2 (Interagency Coordinating Body), 3 (Rural Education Office), and 10 (Rural Education Act) were perceived by the participants as pertaining to, enlarging, or establishing another bureaucracy. While each of these recommendations could provide, or at least enhance, the possibility of additional funds or other assistance for rural schools, apparently the rural participants perceive potential liabilities in the form of increased paperwork and/or loss of local control.

Regardless of the participants' reasons for favoring certain recommendations over others, they clearly stated which recommendations would be their priorities in a Federal Rural Initiative. These priorities are for the federal government to:

1. Examine federal financing formulas and other funding mechanisms to provide local flexibility in rural districts (Recommendation 4).

2. Establish the rural research agenda with the rural constituency (Recommendation 21).

3. Provide additional support for transportation, facilities, and delivery systems to rural districts (Recommendation 5).

4. Enable and encourage rural districts to combine funding from various programs (Recommendation 13).

5. Support communication networks to share information among rural educators (Recommendation 9).

6. Support broad base vocational education programs in rural areas (Recommendation 25).

Fourth, many states, professional educational organizations, associations, and private citizen's groups have been concentrating their resources and energies into the improvement of education in rural areas for several years. Representatives from several states, organizations, associations, and groups presented their efforts in rural education at all regional Roundtable discussions. The implication of this statement is that the education division of the federal government should examine previous and on-going efforts in rural education and involve these states, organizations, associations, and groups in its Rural Education initiative.

Fifth, rural participants at the Roundtables appreciated the opportunity to be involved in a possible federal Rural Education Initiative. This appreciation was evidenced by both written and oral comments at all Roundtables. The implication is that there is interest, whether pro or con, in a federal Rural Education Initiative among the rural constituency and expectations of future involvement have been raised. The rural constituency needs to be informed of and involved in any potential federal Education Initiative actions.

Sixth, the examination of the rural educators' suggestions on improving specific Office of Education programs indicated a lack of awareness on the part of rural educators as to what are actually federal regulations and policies and what are state plan operations. This is understandable since most Federal funds received by rural districts flow through State Departments of Education. This lack of information reinforces the belief that some rural districts are not receiving their equitable share of USOE support in technical assistance and dissemination services.

It was originally envisioned that rural educators would cite specific "chapter and verse" of federal legislation, regulations, or policy which they felt were discriminatory to rural schools and then recommend corrective action. The fact that the rural educators were not able to do so or simply did not do so reflects one of the characteristics of rural school administration--lack of specialists in federal program coordination. It was continually pointed out by the rural constituency that often the superintendent is also the building principal, teacher, coach, public relations specialist, federal program coordinator, etc. in many rural schools.

This situation could be contrasted with the urban school district which usually has specialists for each of these functions. If this had been an "Urban Roundtable" and urban educators were asked to identify "chapter and verse," it is suggested that urban educators probably have been able to do so to a greater extent since most large urban districts have full-time federal education specialists.

Seventh, a minority, but very vocal minority, of the rural participants continually stated that the federal government should stay out of rural education. If there is a federal Rural Education Initiative, it must be sensitive to the views and beliefs of this rural segment.

Finally, the rural participants continually emphasized that they wanted local control and less administrative burden regardless of the recommendation or action. Even though the majority of the rural participants agreed with all 28 recommendations, many did so with the disclaimer that local control and decision-making must be preserved and the recommendation or action must not create an administrative and paperwork burden.

Although the word "local" was probably the most used word by the participants in their comments, it apparently had different connotations when applied by the various participants to various circumstances. For example, to Recommendation 18, which called for the federal government to support the use of education service agencies, one participant used "local" to indicate a state level decision while another used "local" to indicate a county level decision. Similar types of individual interpretations of the word "local" were applied throughout the comments. Regardless of individual application, it is apparent that the rural participants frequently advocated control of many decisions at some level other than the federal government.

APPENDIX A
NATIONAL SEMINAR ON RURAL EDUCATION
RECOMMENDATIONS

NATIONAL SEMINAR ON RURAL EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

May 29 - 31, 1979

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

SPONSORS:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
PROGRAM ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ORGANIZATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SCIENCE AND EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

These recommendations in no way represent official policy of the federal government, nor official endorsement by any of the organizations with which attendees are associated. The votes recorded were obtained by ballot mailed to attendees after the seminar. Ballots were returned by 64 of the 105 registered participants.

PREAMBLE

Rural Americans have a strong and legitimate right to have their rural values and rural life ways respected and enhanced. It is crucial for the federal government to attend to the well-documented pressing needs of rural people who live in areas characterized by severe economic decline, widespread poverty and unemployment, and low educational attainment; but to do this in a way that is carefully designed to preserve indigenous rural values. A national policy of rural development is long past due.

The federal government's education programs have often been characterized by neglect of the problems of rural education. The federal government's commitment to equity for all children should mean that discrimination based on place of residence and sparsity of population will no longer be tolerated.

In addition, rural schools have a unique contribution to make to the solution of the nation's educational problems. Now that the difficulties of providing high quality education in a very large comprehensive schools are increasingly apparent, the nation needs the knowledge of how to have effective education in smaller, more humane, units.

Individuals and organizations who participated in the first National Seminar on Rural Education call for actions.

To:

1. End neglect and discrimination against rural areas.

2. Provide special support for dealing with the unique problems of education within rural areas.

3. Recognize education as a critical component in any strategy of rural development.

I. EQUITY AND QUALITY FOR RURAL EDUCATION

A. Elimination of Anti-Rural Bias

Conference Vote
For Against
45 18

Recommendations:

1. The President should issue an executive order directing the examination of existing and pending education policies, legislation and regulations to eliminate any discrimination against, or neglect of, rural populations.

For Against
54 10

2. A federal interagency coordinating body should be established to facilitate the concentration of responses to rural needs by groups and agencies concerned with the delivery of educational and support services to rural populations.

For Against
53 10

3. An Office for Rural Education should be established within the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW), and each of the agencies and regional offices within the Education Division should appoint at least one Rural Educational Officer to work with that Office.

Explanation

In the past rural populations have often been neglected, and often discriminated against. These anti-rural attitudes and practices are presently found in many policies, legislation, and recommendations, across all Departments of the federal government. A Presidential executive order would facilitate most rapidly a comprehensive examination of such anti-rural bias, and its elimination.

Because federal legislation and regulations rarely contain explicit provisions for rural areas, many affect rural areas in unforeseen ways. In addition different pieces of legislation with explicit rural emphasis are often implemented in conflicting and overlapping ways. Some coordinating body is needed to deal with these situations.

Even given these steps, each agency needs an explicit rural presence, a rural ombudsman, or rural interests will tend over a time to be overlooked or disregarded. Among the responsibilities of an Office of Education and the responsibilities of an Office of Rural Education and the Rural Education Officers would be:

1. assuring that information on federal discretionary programs is disseminated to rural districts and adequate assistance is provided in preparing applications and proposals;

2. monitoring programs to assure that rural districts recieve a fair share of federal monies;

3. revising, as needed or required, guidelines, regulations, and program designs so that the unique conditions of rural education are accomodated in each program.

B.. Special Populations in Rural Areas

Conference Vote For	Against	Recommendations:
60	3	4. The impact of federal financing formulas and other funding mechanisms should be examined to provide maximum local flexibility in dealing with the needs of special rural populations.
55	7	5. Additional support in the areas of transportation, facilities and delivery systems should be considered to enable rural districts to provide equitable services to special populations.

Explanation

Often the financing formulas and other funding mechanisms used to distribute federal resourses fail to account for the conditions in small rural districts, thereby either making it nearly impossible for a rural district to qualify; or else imposing severe and counter-productive con-

straints on the way in which they are required to utilize the resources.

In addition, even an equal share of federal funds, on a per pupil basis, often will be insufficient to overcome the diseconomies of scale involved in providing special rural populations with services comparable to those available in urban and suburban areas. Some additional incentives and compensating factors are needed.

Examples:

The Commissioner should consider such steps as:

1. Revising funding mechanisms in categorical programs (e.g., using sub-county allocations for Title I; eliminating the necessity to generate $7,500 in P.L. 94-142; using proportions of students in a given locale, rather than number of students, as the criterion).

2. Examining state plans where required by federal law to assure equity for rural special populations by requiring, if necessary, a sparsity factor in state formulas.

3. Providing rural set-asides and special rural competitions for federal funds.

C. Enhancing Local Initiatives

Recommendations:

Conference Vote	
For	Against
58	5
56	7

6. The federal government should encourage but not direct, the development of locally relevant curricula through the provision of resources to support rural educators in collecting data; reviewing and adapting, or generating new materials appropriate to local needs; and obtaining appropriate training.

7. The federal government should encourage and support community-based educational organizations and initiatives, particularly those serving traditionally neglected populations.

61 2 8. Technical assistance should be provided to rural school districts to compete on a more equitable basis for competitively-awarded program funds.

58 5 9. The federal government should support communication networks which will invite and encourage the sharing of information among all rural education efforts, and between such efforts and all levels of government.

Explanation

Widespread evidence supports the need for involving local people in adapting or developing educational improvement efforts. Non-involvement virtually guarantees lack of implementation and impact. However, the expertise and manpower are often unavailable, and the costs are too high, for rural schools and communities to collect and adapt, or develop, locally relevant materials. Special support is needed.

Often the appropriate and effective delivery of educational services to rural areas require more than the traditional formal education system, particularly to reach populations who have been poorly served. Community-based educational organizations have proven viable and effective mechanisms for reaching such populations in rural areas.

Recent evidence suggests that in competitive grants programs in particular, rural areas are awarded less than a fair share of the federal grants dollars. Since small districts have few personnel available who have the time or expertise to develop competitively strong proposals, administer federal programs, and respond to data requests and reporting requirements, federal policy must recognize these limitations. Technical assistance in competing and administering are needed.

At present, rural school districts and rural colleges generally have limited ways of communicating the unique needs of a rural system to state and federal agencies. Conversely, no no clear channel of communication exists from the federal level and the states to rural school districts. Deliberate efforts are needed to create such communication mechanism.

Examples

Among the activities which the federal government should undertake are:

1. Supporting the development of rural teachers' skills and knowledge to do curriculum adaptation or development work, through such strategies as the funding of itinerant "master" teachers, summer teacher training seminars, and the designation of particularly successful rural teachers to work with other teachers in their state or region.

2. Revising the eligibility procedures for institutional participation under various laws, such as the Higher Education Act, to include community based programs, particularly those serving traditionally neglected populations.

3. Allowing educational service agencies to provide technical assistance and administrative support to a group of rural districts in competing for and carrying out federal projects. (See Recommendation 18)

4. Sponsor a seminar and continuation of the conference as a forum to discuss the impact of proposed and enacted federal legislation, regulations and policies on the rural school context, including such factors as form design, fund distribution mechanisms, and evaluation procedures for rural schools and rural colleges.

5. Providing a mechanism through which needs could be assessed, priorities identified, and other input solicited from rural schools and districts within states, regions and across the nation;

6. Supporting a network of rural schools and rural colleges in each state and region for the purpose of sharing useful and appropriate information on a variety of topics and concerns facing rural schools.

7. Using professional organizations, such as the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National School Boards Association (NSBA), the Association of School Business Officials (ASBO) the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), and other communication mechanisms than just the existing formal education agencies and institutions.

D. A Rural Education Act

Recommendation:

For	Against
49	13

10. Federal legislation should be enacted to enable rural areas to overcome problems that are unique to rural education if these are not adequately addressed by correcting the inequities in present legislation, regulations, and programs. Such legislation would be called the Rural Education Act.

Explanation

Even if inequities in present legislation and present allocation mechanisms were eliminated so that all rural areas received an equitable proportion of federal funds, there most probably would still be special

problems to be overcome, requiring additional resources, before rural areas would be able to mount equivalent educational programs to those provided in non-rural areas. While this might be accomplished by adding separate special "isolation" facotrs to existing formulas, a more efficient way would be the enactment of a special Rural Education Act. Such as Act would have the additional advantage of focusing attention on the unique problems and advantages of rural education and rural schooling.

II. LINKING RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL EDUCATION

A. Enhancing Local Initiative

Conference Vote For	Against	Recommendations:
57	4	11. The federal government should make available funds in such a way that they increase the capacity of rural populations to assess broadly the local needs that after the provision of effective educational programs, and to initiate and implement activities to meet those broader community needs.
53	10	12. Particular emphasis should be placed on supporting community-based organizations, committees, and insitutions which involve a cross-section of the community in a collaborative effort to meet some local community need which inhibits the provision of effective educational programs.
54	9	13. Rural communities and organizations should be enabled and encouraged to combine funding from various agencies or programs in order to improve the delivery of educational services and further the community development process.

Explanation

Not only are the needs of the rural population unique, they will differ from rural community to another. Furthermore, within any given rural community the needs are interrelated.

The broader issues to poverty, high unemployment or underemployment, economic decline, and high in or out migration affect rural education more directly and identifiably than in larger cities.

Yet too often rural community development efforts ignore the local education system and do not provide for its involvement. And too often the only institutions elibible for federal education resources are the schools and school districts. Particularly in rural communities, the isolation of schools from the other institutions of the community greatly restricts effectiveness.

Increasingly it is apparent that the recipients of services must take an active, responsible, coordinative role in their delivery to insure their appropriate use.

Support and encouragement for organizing appropriate mixes of local people, organizations, and institutions to solve local problems would yield large dividends in the effectiveness with which educational and other services are delivered.

Yet at present laws and regulations require most federal monies to be administered separately. While this may make sense where large sums are involved, in most rural areas a particular district's or communit's allotment is generally so small that the separate administration is highly inefficient. Combing funding at the local level, or at least combining the administrative portion of the funding, would greatly

improve the coordination, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs.

Examples

Among the activities which the federal government should consider are:

1. Expanding existing programs, (e.g., the Rural Development Act of 1972, Titles I, V, VI) to enhance local ability to acquire, develop, and utilize information resources, services, programs and technical assistance for rural communities, regardless of size.

2. Establishing a program of grants and contracts under the Higher Education Act, or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to promote community-based educational initiatives, and community efforts to mobilize local educational resources to combat community problems.

B. Investivation of International Experiments

Conference Vote		Recommendation
For	Against	
50	13	14. The federal government, through cooperation with international organizations, should report on apparently successful experiments in other countries to link rural education and rural development, and make this information widely available to rural people, and to the personnel of programs serving rural America.

Explanation

The difficulties that plague efforts at linking rural education and rural development in the

U.S. often are absent in other countries. Large scale efforts have been undertaken in other countries, and mechanisms for sharing information among countries are available through such international organizations as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OEDC). Many of these efforts are relevant to the U.S., if the effort would be made to find out about them, and to disseminate the information.

III. DELIVERY OF SERVICES TO RURAL EDUCATION

A. Special Rural Training Programs and Incentives

Conf. Vote		Recommendations
For	Against	
55	5	15. The federal government should provide resources for the establishment of specialized rural preservice and in-service training programs for teachers and other educational personnel.
		16. The federal government should establish incentive programs to attract personnel to be trained for, and to provide services in, rural schools.

Explanation

Currently only a handful of agencies and institutions offer training programs designed to prepare educational personnel for rural service. The special characteristics of rural communities and rural education have been identified, documented, and ignored. There is now a necessity to develop more focused training of teachers that will allow them to deal effectively and efficiently with uniquely rural problems, while taking advantage of the unique opportunities of rural schooling. Obvious among the problems

relating to the preparation of education personnel for work in rural areas is dealing with geographic isolation. Equally important, though perhaps not as obvious, is respect for the great diversity among the thousands of communities that comprise rural America. In addition, given the special concern of the federal government for special populations, particular attention is needed to the unique problems of providing services to special populations in rural areas.

While there are problems, smaller schools more intimately related to their surrounding communities offer unique opportunities. Teachers and administrators need preparation for taking advantage of them.

For a variety of reasons the ability of many rural communities to attract and retain highly qualified educational personnel is limited. Not only are salaries often lower, but the unique conditions of rural work are unexpected by those trained for urban and suburban classrooms. As in other professions, such as medicine, special incentives can be provided which will attract high quality personnel.

B. Technology

Conference Vote		Recommendation
For	Against	
56	4	17. The federal government should expand efforts to develop and utilize appropriate technology in the delivery of services to rural education.

Explanation

Appropriate educational technology appears to have great potential for overcoming large physical

distances, and for providing a wide variety of high quality instructional programs to any location, however remote. Yet, rural school and rural college personnel are handicapped in keeping abreast of technological developments having potential for the improvement of rural educational practice. Moreover, the high capital costs of technology are a serious constraint on the ability of rural schools to implement technological approaches with high potential. The active involvement of the federal goverment in disseminating best practices, supporting training efforts, and in defraying the costs of installing technological innovations would appear to be particularly valuable as a strategy for assisting rural education.

Examples

Among the activities which the federal government should support are:

1. Compiling current studies and existing information on technological systems, such as computer-based teaching, educational telephone networks, TV and cable TV, Satellites, mobile units, etc;

2. Preparing and widely disseminating publications to keep rural educators informed of the uses of technology that could improve educational practice in rural schools;

3. Encouraging and assisting state and local rural school districts and rural colleges to identify needs that might be met through utilization of technology;

4. Supporting the provision of training opportunities for local staff in adapting appropriate technology;

5. Collecting for dissemination from state and local rural school districts and rural colleges reports and results of any educational technology adaptations.

Conference Vote
For Against
51 10

C. Education Service Agencies (ESAs)

18. The federal government should support the use of education service agencies* in the implementation of federal program initiatives, research, dissemination, and other school improvement efforts focused on rural schools.

Explanation

How states organize systems of education to deliver services is the business of the respective states and not a matter of federal policy. Assuring that whatever deliver system a state elects leads to the equitable distribution of high quality services, however, is of fundamental federal interest. Various forms of education service agencies (e.g., special district ESA's, cooperative ESA's, regionalized SEA/ESA's) presently operating in many states are demonstrating their potential for delivering services to rural schools. This is especially true in the important areas of education of people with handicapping conditions, vocational/technical education, media and library services, curriculum development, staff development, and many other high-cost support services requiring specialized staff and/or equipment ordinarily beyond the means of individual rural schools. There would

*The intent of this recommendation is to refer to whatever ESAs a state may have, which could include the State Department of Education itself, post-secondary institutions, the extension service of the Department of Agriculture, and any other organization or agency engaged in providing specialized services to rural areas.

be great merit in improving the ability of local districts, in conjunction with state agencies, to engage in collaborative efforts through the ESAs serving them. Federal incentives have been important stimuli for collaborative action in the past. In particular, making ESAs eligible to receive funds when part of a collaborative effort would help greatly.

IV. DATA COLLECTION AND RESEARCH

Conference Vote
For Against

A. Data Collection

Recommendation

19. The federal government should provide for the systematic collection, compilation and analysis of data on the status of rural education.

60 1

Explanation

Currently very limited data are available on rural education. For example, many of the published statistical tabulations of the National Center for Education Statistics fail to report data for school districts with fewer than 2,500 pupils, and provide only limited data on school districts located in non-metropolitan counties.

When rural data are available, the sample size tends to be inadequate for disaggregation by other variables of interest. For example, while the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) provides data on some rural students across the whole country, the NAEP data cannot be broken down further to look at rural students in the Southeast, black rural students, migrant students in the Southwest, etc. Similar problems exist with other federal data bases dealing with education. In addition, current federal accounting procedures do not permit the tabulation of expenditure data according to the type of school district which is the eventual recipient of federal funds. Lack of this data inhibits consideration of educational equity within rural areas.

Examples

Data collection activities should:

1. Include information on student performance; curriculum and program offerings; staff qualifications and limitations; scope and quality of facilities; education service agencies; and other educational resources; the costs of transportation; the costs associated with the instructional program; pupils with handicapping conditions; and related social, economic, and demographic characteristics of rural populations;

2. Be aggregated from existing data bases and/or collected by augmenting the existing data collection efforts of the National Center for Education Statistics and other similar efforts.

3. Maximize cooperation with state departments of education, other state education agencies, and local districts in data collection and compilation;

4. Be based on samples of sufficient size to permit disaggregation by race, sex, region of the country, district and school size, population density, and types and degrees of rurality;

5. Employ a more refined definition of rural than "non-metropolitan."

6. Review periodically the validity and scope of data bases;

7. Be reported in regular publications such as a special rural section of The Condition of Education.

B. Research

Conference Vote For	Against	Recommendation
58	2	20. The federal government should increase its support of research on rural education, to enhance local and state abilities to make decisions about rural schools, and rural colleges, and to provide a sounder basis for federal education policy.
56	0	21. The research agenda for rural education should be established in conjunction with rural educators and community members.

Explanation

Despite the substantial proportion of students who attend school is rural districts, an infinitisesimal share of the federal education research budget has been devoted to the study of rural education issues. Debates and decisions about rural education at all levels of the system - whether or not to consolidate schools, whether rural students recieve a "fair share" of federal funds, etc. - are often based on competing myths and ideologies rather than objective data and systematic analysis. Improving the educational opportunities of all rural youngsters requires a substantial effort to close the research and information gap, an effort in which the federal government should assume leadership.

Examples

Probable examples of priority issues for study include:

1. Benefits and problems associated with different size schools in rural areas;

2. Trade-offs associated with various school and district size decisions, given rising costs of fuel for transportation;

3. Measurement of the quality of education programs being provided in rural schools and rural colleges in different regions of the country and in different types of rural communities;

4. Examination of existing data, demonstration projects, and needed areas of research to identify productive practices and processes that effect programs and services in rural schools of various sizes;

5. Development of improved dissemination strategies for sharing the results of such research with isolated rural districts;

6. The distribution patterns of federal funds between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas and among more and less rural districts within non-metropolitan areas;

7. Initiating research studies which expand knowledge about the social and cultural dynamics of different types of rural school systems and about how their dynamics differ from those of urban and suburban school systems;

8. The feasibility of integrating or coordinating appropriate education programs with other social service programs in rural communities

V. VOCATIONAL AND CAREER TRAINING IN RURAL AREAS

A. Coordination of Training Programs

Conference Vote		Recommendation
For	Against	
61	2	22. The federal government should provide for formal coordination of federal programs for rural youth, adults, and communities concerned with career/vocational education, adult education, employment training (CETA), and economic development

Explanation

There is a relative lack of coordination of federal education training programs. Each program type seems to have been conceived and implemented with little regard for its potential complementary role with other programs. A large-scale , nationally-coordinated effort is needed to attain better program efficiency and responsiveness to comprehensive rural training needs.

B. Guidance and Counseling

Conference Vote For	Against	Recommendation
59	4	23. The federal government should sponsor the identification and development of guidance and counseling programs and materials that focus on the unique needs of rural learners.

Explanation

While little empirical evidence exists, there seems no doubt that rural youth and adults are basically without sufficient and quality career guidance and counseling. This condition results in:

1. unrealistic career aspirations, high or low;

2. unstructured and disjounted career planning;

3. unemployment or under-employment due to replacement, job maintenance, and transition adjustment problems.

Examples

Among the activities the federal government should support are:

1. identifying guidance program materials and

practices which have proven to be effective in rural educational settings;

2. establishing specialized career vocational counselor training programs that focus on the unique needs of small, rural schools; and

3. helping develop guidance programs addressing the unique needs of adults and out-of-school youths in rural communities.

C. Demonstration Delivery Systems

Conf. Vote		Recommendation
For	Against	
55	3	24. The federal government should support research, program development and evaluation of educational service delivery systems which are especially tailored to bring career/vocational services to rural children, youth, and adults.

Explanation

Children, youth, and adults in small, rural schools have rarely had the full access to career/vocational education and employment training programs available to their urban counterparts. Because regional training sites may officially encompase a large geographic area while actually serving a small population clustered nearby, the most geographically isolated rural students still have little real access.
Exploration of other alternatives is badly needed.

Examples

Alternatives the federal government should include:

1. Area Vocational Centers;
2. Community-based satellite programs;
3. Mobile facilities, and
4. The use of educational technologies.

D. Program Designs for Rural Occupations

Conference Vote		Recommendation
For	Against	
62	1	25. Vocational education supported by the federal government in rural areas should include programs which provide the broad base of diversified knowledge and skills which are often required for employment and entrepreneurship in rural areas, as well as for supplementary income and rural survival.

Explanation

Because job markets in rural areas are limited (encouraging out-migration) and often rapidly changing, vocational education programs need to teach transferable skills. In addition, rural people can benefit from skills which allow them to supplement a lower mean income by taking advantage of available rural resources (e.g., gardening, limited animal husbandry, woodcutting, etc.). The value of such vocational education must be judged in terms of its long-run benefits. Vocational programs (including Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics) should be evaluated on the basis of the general usefulness of the skills and knowledge imported, in addition to specific job placement.

E. Rural Women

Recommendation

Conference Vote For	Against
56	8

26. The federal government should establish research and action programs to meet the specific needs of rural women, especially those who are entering or re-entering the labor market.

Explanation

Rural women are at a disadvantage within an already limited rural job market. They need special programs to help them make informed decisions about occupational options, career planning, and values issues within a comparatively traditional culture. Such programs must be made fully accessible to rural women.

Examples

Among the activities that the federal government should support are:

1. Counseling programs for rural women.
2. Skills training
3. Assistance in gaining access to non-traditional occupations
4. Support services (e.g., day care) for rural women who want to work

VI. ENERGY AND RURAL EDUCATION

A. Increasing Energy Costs and Transportation

Recommendation

Conference Vote For	Against
61	3

27. The federal government should assess the wisdom of school consolidation policies in relation to the impact of rising fuel costs and

shortages on school transportation.

Explanation

For many years, the trend has been to consolidate smaller schools and/or school districts into larger, more comprehensive facilities and/or districts. These consolidations were intended to provide student access to expanded programs and curriculum offerings, achieve economies of scale and improve education. More recent research indicates that effective educational programs have been conducted in relatively small facilities. This, coupled with dramatically increased transportation costs, suggests the need for a re-examination of economies of smaller satellite education centers. Such a study would determine the potential savings in energy and capital investment for a limited number of arrangements, i.e., what advantages and disadvantages occur when transportation is cut and decentralized facilities are utilized or constructed? What are the costs/benefits of various combinations?

Examples

Among the studies that should be supported are:

1. An examination of the costs, in dollars and energy, to replace buses with facilities that will meet the need of rural education, compared to employing the same costs to continue busing;

2. A comparison of the social advantages and disadvantages, e.g., more time in school activities, racial balance, increased or decreased staffing.

B. Energy Conservation in Rural Buildings

Conference Vote For Against

Recommendation

28. The federal government should develop a program of energy conservation measures, relevant to rural schools and rural colleges, and provide technical assistance in the implementation of these measures.

Explanation

The impact of the energy situation on rural schools and rural colleges is unique. Most schools were designed and built in a time when energy was inexpensive and abundant. Construction funds were limited, and major emphasis was placed on achieving adequate space and facilities. Little, if any, regard was given for the energy efficiency of the structures. Lighting, ventilation, heating, and cooling systems were over-designed. These inherent building characteristics, coupled with poor maintenance programs, have resulted in facilities that waste as much as 25 to 50 percent of the energy used.

These structural problems are further compounded by the nature of the public school enterprise. Schools, unlike business and industry, are unable to pass on the higher cost of energy to their customers. Since fuel expenditures must be budgeted six to twelve months in advance with only limited information and weak projections of increased costs, districts may have to radically trim their educational programs to meet rising costs. Budgets are entrenched in traditional expenditure patterns wherein 75 to 85 percent of the budget is designed for personnel costs, with as little as 3 to 5 percent allocated for energy. Because funds for capital improvements are virtually non-existent, implementing energy-savings improvements is nearly impossible.

Finally, rural schools lack the technical help to solve energy problems. In many cases, maintenance and conservation efforts are assigned to personnel who have other full-time responsibilities. Energy proglems cannot be properly assessed because records are incomplete or non-existent. Even when attempts are made to improve the energy efficiency of schools, apathy, limited technical knowledge, and lack of public support bring the process to a standstill. In short, school personnel do not know "what to do," "how to do it," nor have the "money to do it."

APPENDIX B
RURAL ROUNDTABLES SITES AND DATES BY REGION

RURAL ROUNDTABLES SITES AND DATES BY REGION

USOE Region	Location/Chairperson	States	Roundtable Site	Date
I	Boston, Massachusetts Dr. Thomas J. Burns	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont	Sheraton-Wayfarer Motor Inn Bedford, New Hampshire	9/28/79
II	New York, New York Dr. William D. Green	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Canal Zone	State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York	9/20/79
III	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Dr. Albert C. Crambert	Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington, D.C.	University of Delaware Newark, Delaware	9/13/79
IV	Atlanta, Georgia Dr. William L. Lewis	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee	Tuskegee Institute Tuskegee, Alabama	9/18/79
V	Chicago, Illinois Dr. Juliette Lester	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin	Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	9/11/79
VI	Dallas, Texas Mr. Edward Baca	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas	The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas	9/26/79
VII	Kansas City, Missouri Dr. Harold L. Blackburn	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	Holiday Inn, International Airport, Kansas City, Missouri	9/25/79
VIII	Denver, Colorado Dr. H. John Runkel	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming	Colorado State University Ft. Collins, Colorado	9/24/79
IX	San Francisco, California Dr. Caroline J. Gillin	Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, American Samoa, Trust Territory of the Pacific, Guam, and Northern Mariannas Islands	Holiday Inn Fresno, California	9/19/79
X	Seattle, Washington Mr. Allen T. Apodaca	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington	University of Idaho Moscow, Idaho	9/27/79
			University of Alaska Fairbanks, Alaska	9/27/79

APPENDIX C

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES BY RECOMMENDATION

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES BY RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation	Key Words*	Total N	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	1. Executive Order	500	200(40.0)	174(34.8)	43(8.6)	51(10.2)	32(6.4)
2	2. Interagency Coordinating Body	496	127(25.6)	173(34.8)	60(12.0)	82(16.5)	54(10.8)
3	3. Rural Education Office	503	128(25.4)	175(34.7)	64(12.7)	74(14.7)	62(12.3)
4	4. Flexible Funding Mechanism	498	332(66.6)	141(28.3)	10(2.0)	6(1.2)	9(1.8)
5	5. Additional Financial Support	501	277(55.2)	170(33.9)	20(3.9)	20(3.9)	14(2.7)
6	6. Rural Curriculum	498	163(32.7)	222(44.5)	42(8.4)	43(8.6)	28(5.6)
7	7. Encourage Community-Based Organizations	498	161(32.3)	227(45.5)	45(9.0)	31(6.2)	34(6.8)
8	8. Technical Assistance	499	234(46.8)	157(31.4)	34(6.8)	47(9.4)	27(5.4)
9	9. Communication Network	501	182(36.3)	247(49.3)	37(7.3)	20(3.9)	15(2.7)
10	10. Rural Education Act	494	146(29.5)	170(34.4)	86(17.4)	51(10.3)	41(8.2)
11	11. Local Capacity Building	495	179(36.1)	217(43.8)	40(8.0)	34(6.8)	25(5.0)
12	12. Broader Involvement	487	116(23.8)	216(44.3)	93(19.0)	33(6.7)	29(5.9)
13	13. Combine Funding	493	204(41.3)	222(45.0)	37(7.5)	17(3.4)	13(2.6)
14	14. International Experiments	496	101(20.3)	222(44.7)	75(15.1)	62(12.5)	36(7.2)
15	15. Rural Teacher Training	497	181(36.4)	173(34.8)	48(9.6)	58(11.6)	37(7.4)
16	16. Rural Teacher Incentives	496	171(34.4)	167(33.6)	58(11.6)	67(13.5)	33(6.6)
17	17. Technology	496	164(33.0)	222(44.7)	50(10.0)	34(6.8)	26(5.2)
18	18. Education Service Agencies	494	164(33.1)	233(47.0)	51(10.3)	26(5.2)	20(4.0)
19	19. Rural Data	494	133(26.9)	222(44.9)	64(12.9)	37(7.4)	38(7.6)
20	20. Rural Research	495	184(37.1)	206(41.6)	51(10.3)	33(6.6)	21(4.2)
21	21. Collaborative Research Agenda	490	231(47.1)	213(43.4)	22(4.4)	11(2.2)	13(2.6)
22	22. Coordination of Vocational Prog.	496	183(36.8)	200(40.3)	54(10.8)	31(6.2)	28(5.6)
23	23. Guidance and Counseling	493	144(29.3)	217(44.0)	54(10.9)	44(8.9)	34(6.8)
24	24. Vocational Serv. Delivery Systems	490	180(35.5)	221(43.6)	33(6.5)	37(7.3)	19(3.7)
25	25. Broad-Based Vocational Education	490	202(41.2)	216(44.0)	38(7.7)	18(3.6)	16(3.2)
26	26. Rural Women	488	145(29.7)	185(37.9)	73(14.9)	51(10.4)	34(6.9)
27	27. School Consolidation Policies	478	164(34.3)	140(29.2)	43(8.9)	61(12.7)	70(14.6)
28	28. Energy Conservation	483	185(38.3)	197(40.7)	33(6.8)	39(8.0)	29(6.0)

Percentages may not total due to rounding.
( ) = Percentages
*The complete recommendation with accompanying rationale and examples are detailed in Appendix A.

APPENDIX D

RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS' AGREEMENT BY RECOMMENDATION AND GROUP

RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS' AGREEMENT BY RECOMMENDATION AND GROUP*

R = Recommendation RS = Raw Score* % = Percentage of Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing

GROUPS	1			2			3			4			T		
RANK	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS
1	4	90.2	48	4	96.5	514	4	92.9	128	4	91.5	91	4	94.9	781
2	25	93.0	43	5	90.1	450	5	93.0	114	5	79.6	73	5	89.1	676
3	21	96.5	41	21	88.9	416	21	92.6	112	21	93.0	69	21	90.5	638
4	13	90.2	39	13	84.7	375	13	89.5	108	9	88.3	69	13	86.3	587
5	7	87.0	39	8	81.4	375	25	89.1	103	13	87.9	65	25	85.6	570
6	5	86.6	39	25	83.8	367	9	86.1	99	20	77.5	59	9	85.6	561
7	8	90.2	37	9	84.8	356	18	79.9	87	25	83.0	57	8	78.2	523
8	24	87.0	37	24	81.9	342	22	78.5	84	22	76.6	55	24	79.1	510
9	9	77.0	37	11	81.5	336	20	77.3	82	19	71.0	52	20	78.7	499
10	22	80.6	36	18	80.6	327	11	83.4	81	17	76.6	51	18	80.1	495
11	28	86.1	35	20	78.5	327	24	83.2	80	24	75.7	51	11	79.9	491
12	18	90.5	34	1	76.4	314	19	78.0	78	6	71.5	51	22	77.1	479
13	17	80.5	34	28	80.0	312	17	76.4	76	7	76.6	50	28	79.0	470
14	1	80.5	33	22	76.5	304	28	75.3	74	28	75.7	49	17	77.7	464
15	26	79.9	33	17	78.1	303	6	78.1	71	8	70.6	48	1	74.8	459
16	20	86.6	31	6	77.8	297	7	76.9	70	1	66.6	48	7	77.8	450
17	11	86.1	31	7	77.4	291	26	68.5	66	18	73.1	47	6	77.2	449
18	16	79.9	31	15	72.7	271	23	71.7	65	15	66.6	43	15	71.2	403
19	15	80.5	30	23	75.2	265	1	72.0	64	11	63.3	43	23	73.2	393
20	6	83.3	29	16	69.8	264	8	67.7	63	10	60.0	37	16	68.0	376
21	23	74.1	29	10	66.5	235	14	65.4	60	12	67.2	36	19	71.8	375
22	12	70.9	28	12	68.6	234	15	64.3	60	26	64.3	35	12	68.1	357
23	27	70.9	28	19	69.5	222	12	65.8	59	16	63.3	34	26	67.6	356
24	14	76.6	27	26	66.5	222	16	60.6	47	23	63.3	34	10	63.9	329
25	3	74.1	25	14	64.6	183	2	55.7	37	27	62.8	31	14	65.0	290
26	19	79.2	23	27	64.1	179	3	58.5	36	2	56.6	23	27	63.5	267
27	2	72.3	23	2	61.3	155	10	55.7	34	3	56.6	23	2	60.4	238
28	10	66.6	23	3	59.9	148	27	58.8	29	14	62.0	20	3	60.1	232

*To account for the differences between a strongly agree and agree response, as well as between a strongly disagree and disagree response, a raw score was calculated for each recommendation. The raw score was calculated by assigning the following weighted values to each response:

-2 for each strongly disagree
-1 for each disagree
0 for each undecided
1 for each agree
2 for each strongly agree

APPENDIX E

RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGES OF AGREED AND STRONGLY AGREED RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS, BY REGION

RANK ORDER AND PERCENTAGES OF AGREED AND STRONGLY AGREED RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS, BY REGION

RANK	REGION 1			REGION 2			REGION 3			REGION 4			REGION 5			REGION 6			REGION 7			REGION 8			REGION 9			REGION 10		
	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS	R	%	RS
1	4	97.3	192	5	96.4	45	21	100.0	15	4	97.3	58	4	90.9	63	4	93.8	99	4	95.1	126	4	100.0	45	4	92.8	62	4	95.9	80
2	5	93.1	179	4	92.8	43	22	100.0	15	5	92.3	58	5	79.5	56	21	91.8	76	5	88.2	104	21	100.0	40	5	90.4	59	21	86.9	69
3	21	96.5	166	21	96.2	42	25	90.0	15	8	84.2	52	8	81.8	54	5	85.9	75	9	89.2	103	17	100.0	35	1	83.3	47	15	79.1	66
4	25	86.8	156	22	96.2	41	13	80.0	14	13	94.8	50	21	88.6	51	13	90.1	73	21	85.3	91	20	100.0	35	21	82.9	45	13	85.4	65
5	13	87.8	155	13	96.4	39	19	90.0	13	25	92.5	50	9	86.3	44	25	87.0	70	20	80.0	90	6	96.0	35	25	82.9	43	25	93.4	62
6	9	87.1	146	8	92.8	36	28	88.8	13	11	84.6	44	22	79.5	44	1	76.9	70	18	80.7	83	18	96.0	35	9	83.3	41	5	87.7	62
7	28	86.0	140	18	85.7	36	1	80.0	13	24	90.0	43	28	79.0	43	8	75.3	61	17	79.2	83	25	92.0	34	8	82.9	40	18	83.3	58
8	8	80.3	140	9	89.2	35	4	80.0	13	9	85.0	43	13	77.2	40	18	80.6	60	25	79.2	83	19	100.0	32	24	80.9	40	11	89.5	56
9	24	74.7	130	20	82.1	35	8	80.0	13	21	84.6	43	7	79.5	38	24	74.6	59	24	76.8	82	13	96.0	31	13	77.5	39	9	81.6	55
10	11	79.8	124	7	92.8	33	11	80.0	13	20	82.0	43	20	72.7	36	11	79.0	58	13	81.9	81	9	92.0	31	18	78.5	38	17	83.3	54
11	22	80.0	123	19	82.1	33	24	80.0	13	17	85.0	42	11	72.7	35	20	79.6	55	6	78.0	79	15	88.0	31	23	78.5	37	22	79.1	52
12	20	78.4	117	28	85.7	32	18	80.0	12	19	84.2	41	18	74.4	33	9	79.0	52	28	81.2	77	24	92.0	30	6	85.3	36	24	85.1	50
13	6	76.7	115	24	89.2	31	23	88.8	11	18	89.7	40	24	77.2	32	22	75.8	51	11	78.5	76	12	91.6	30	22	73.8	36	7	83.3	50
14	17	75.2	112	25	92.8	29	6	80.0	11	27	82.5	40	1	69.7	30	7	73.8	51	1	73.4	71	7	88.0	30	15	73.1	32	12	79.1	50
15	27	77.3	108	11	82.1	29	9	80.0	11	16	82.0	40	17	72.0	29	10	80.3	49	8	71.9	71	11	92.0	29	28	72.5	32	1	81.2	49
16	26	77.1	108	17	78.5	29	20	77.7	11	7	81.0	40	25	71.4	28	6	73.8	49	16	70.2	64	5	91.3	29	16	64.2	32	6	77.5	49
17	7	76.9	107	12	82.1	27	26	88.8	10	15	80.0	39	23	70.4	26	16	70.9	47	7	75.9	63	8	84.0	26	20	73.8	31	23	76.5	47
18	1	73.5	107	14	89.2	26	27	70.0	10	22	77.5	37	19	68.1	26	19	75.8	43	19	67.8	61	23	84.0	24	17	70.7	30	20	70.8	46
19	15	74.3	105	23	82.1	25	5	80.0	9	6	78.9	34	2	62.7	26	12	71.1	43	22	67.4	58	28	76.0	24	7	68.2	30	16	68.7	46
20	23	70.1	105	26	77.7	25	17	80.0	9	28	76.9	34	26	65.9	25	17	70.9	41	23	69.0	53	22	68.0	22	10	68.2	27	14	67.3	41
21	18	73.0	100	1	71.4	25	15	70.0	9	10	74.3	34	3	63.6	25	2	66.1	40	26	67.0	53	3	72.0	20	11	68.2	27	28	77.2	38
22	10	68.1	99	15	77.7	21	7	60.0	8	26	80.0	33	16	63.6	25	3	70.7	37	1	65.8	50	1	75.0	18	12	68.2	27	26	59.5	38
23	16	68.9	96	16	71.4	21	12	60.0	8	12	71.7	32	15	63.6	24	28	66.6	37	15	62.6	49	27	63.6	12	19	59.5	27	2	70.2	37
24	12	59.4	71	6	71.4	20	10	60.0	6	2	76.9	30	14	68.1	23	23	68.8	36	12	67.4	47	10	52.0	12	3	59.5	26	19	77.0	36
25	14	64.0	70	10	64.2	19	3	60.0	5	23	74.3	29	12	61.3	22	26	62.9	35	10	53.6	34	26	66.6	11	26	54.7	18	10	61.2	33
26	19	62.2	61	3	60.7	16	14	50.0	4	1	67.5	29	6	63.9	21	15	58.7	27	27	59.2	32	14	56.0	8	14	58.5	17	8	65.3	30
27	2	60.3	60	2	60.7	13	16	40.0	3	14	72.5	26	27	60.9	18	14	56.6	25	3	55.9	25	2	52.0	5	27	50.0	14	3	63.2	23
28	3	54.3	45	27	60.7	11	2	55.5	2	3	55.0	11	10	56.8	16	27	61.0	23	2	51.1	16	16	44.0	2	2	47.5	8	27	45.2	-1
	N = 118			N=28			N=10			N=40			N=44			N=65			N=87			N=25			N=42			N=49		

R = *Recommendation*

RS = *Raw Score calculated by assigning the value of*

-2 for Strongly Disagree
-1 for Disagree
0 for Undecided
1 for Agree
2 for Strongly Agree